29th November 1955]

A.—(*a*) A list[a] showing the merchant bodies invited for the Conference is appended.

(*b*) Requests were made by a large number of merchant bodies for representation in the Conference. Invitations were issued to bodies representing major trades in the State without making the number too unwieldy.

(*c*) No. There was no request from the Malabar Merchants' Association for representation in the Conference. Two trade bodies of Malabar were represented.

(*d*) & (*e*) A copy of the agenda[a] for the conference is appended. The conference was only an informal one to ascertain the views of the various merchant bodies on questions relating to the levy and administration of sales tax. No resolutions were passed or final decisions taken at the conference.

[*Note.*—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—STATEMENT UNDER RULE 4 OF THE ASSEMBLY RULES *RE* FAILURE OF THE GOVERNMENT TO APPEAL AGAINST FINDING OF THE SETTLEMENT OFFICER DECLARING NAZARETHPET TO BE NOT AN INAM ESTATE.

MR. SPEAKER : I have received notice of a Motion under rule 40 from the hon. Member Sri S. C. C. Anthoni Pillai calling the attention of the Hon. Minister for Revenue to a matter of urgent public importance, viz., failure of Government to prefer an appeal against the finding of the Settlement Officer, Chittoor, dated 14th August 1950, in S. No. 14, Sriperambudur, relating to Nazarethpet village, Chingleput district. **12-10 p.m.**

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONI PILLAI : Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to a matter of urgent public importance, viz., that in Nazarethpet village of Chingleput district a long drawn out Satyagraha movement has been launched, as a result of which one hundred and twenty-five people belonging to the Socialist Party have been arrested. The history of the dispute relates to a decision given by the Settlement Officer under the Estates Abolition Act. This Settlement Officer has declared that it is not an inam village and that this particular area cannot be taken over by the Government for distribution to the peasantry. Now, Sir, what the residents of this village contend is, that the Settlement Officer in coming to a decision did not abide by the legal provisions contained in that Act. The Act specifically requires that a Settlement Officer before he arrives at a decision, should call for all relevant documents in the possession of the Government. It has been represented that among the many documents examined, the Settlement Officer did not call for the original grant that was made, though this particular document was specifically referred to in the Inam Register as being in the possession of the Government. This particular officer did not take sufficient steps to see that the residents of the village were present at the enquiry. There was only one person present at the enquiry

[a] **Printed as Appendix VI on pages 664 665 infra.**

and that was the Headman of the village and that man happened to be an employee of the concerned Mirasdar. Sir, a memorandum has been submitted by the residents of the village drawing the attention of the Government to the fact that there are certain documents, that certified copies of the documents are in their possession and that these documents would show that a grant was made in 1802 by one Lionel Place, Collector, East India Company, to one Varadappa Mudaliar. The portions of the document read as follows :—

"You shall use your influence and endeavour with the ryots of the said district to extend the cultivation of the lands to the utmost in their power and in such manner as may best regulate their labour.

"These are the principal duties to which you are to attend. But, you are constantly to be watchful and informed yourself of all the circumstances of the district, conciliate the minds of the inhabitants of the Sircar, prevent all improper combinations among them; and diligently inculcate obedience; and make them understand the happiness which they enjoy under the protection and justice of the Government."

For performing this duty, he was to get sixty per cent *mel-varam* alone in the specified villages which included Nazarethpet village.

MR. SPEAKER : Under the rules, the hon. Member should make only a brief speech on the motion.

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONI PILLAI : Sir, I myself have interviewed the Collector of Chingleput and he told me that he was not the authority to receive the memorandum which I submitted to him as he had nothing to do with such matter. Thereafter, I met the Commissioner for Settlement of Estates and he told me that a circular has been issued to all District Collectors asking them to go into every award given by a Settlement Officer with a view to prefer an appeal within the time limit. This particular Collector though he has got the circular, has not made any attempt up-to-date to examine whether the village is an inam village. The behaviour of the police in connection with the satyagraha movement is also largely to be questioned. Several of the satyagrahis have been assaulted and sent but not a single rowdy in that village has been arrested so far, though the incident took place two months ago. The Government officers should be above suspicion in these matters. Hereafter when certain allegations are made that the concerned officers are not acting in a proper manner, according to the legal procedures laid down, or according to the circulars issued by the Government, then I submit, Sir, the Hon. Minister should look into that matter himself. In this case, Sir, the Government should concede the very simple demand of the satyagrahis and of the residents of the village, namely, that an appeal be preferred within the time limit to the Tribunal under the Estates Abolition Amendment Act. Thank you.

29th November 1955]

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, after a long speech, the hon. member came to the point only in his last sentence and I propose to reply to it. The village of Nazarethpet in Sriperambudur taluk, Chingleput district, has been declared by the Settlement Officer in his order dated 14th August 1950 to be not an inam estate as defined in Section 2 (7) of the Abolition Act. It has therefore not yet been notified under that Act and taken over by the Government. Till the Abolition Act was amended at the beginning of this year, there was no specific provision in the Act for an appeal by the Government in such cases. After the amendment, all closed cases are again being reviewed so that action may be taken to file the appeals wherever necessary, before 18th January 1956. It is the last date for appeals for cases closed before 19th January 1955. The ryots of the village in a petition dated 11th November 1955 represented to the Board of Revenue that the order of the Settlement Officer, Chittoor, mentioned above is not correct. They have requested the Board to take steps to file an appeal before the Estates Abolition Tribunal for setting aside the Settlement Officer's order. The Board has called for a report from the Collector of Chingleput and it is awaited. A decision will be taken in the matter in consultation with the law officers of the Government and orders passed sufficiently in advance of 18th January 1956, which is the last date for appeal.

III—POINT OF INFORMATION *RE* SHORT NOTICE QUESTION *RE* LATHI CHARGE IN KOLLENGODE.

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Sir, I had given notice of a Short Notice question regarding the lathi charge at Kollengode and the Hon. Minister was pleased to state that he will give the information within two days. Afterwards, I was informed that reply was awaited. But, I did not find any mention about that in the agenda. As the Assembly is expected to adjourn today, will the Hon. Minister kindly give a reply?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not know where it has been delayed. I am told by the Department that they have not received the file. That is the only cause for the delay. I shall find out the cause. In the hurry-burry of Mr. Bulganin's visit during this period, I was not able to find that out. I hope the hon. Member will appreciate that.

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Sir, I consider that this is a very important issue affecting the lives of certain people there because many of them are injured. I think the Government will take a more serious view of the situation. That is why I put that Short Notice Question and there is absolutely no other way of voicing our views here. That is why, I wanted an answer.

MR SPEAKER : The statement is not ready. That is the answer. The next item is the Report of the Committee on Estimates. Dr. Krishna Rao will present the Report.